

### **REMARKS**

The Abstract has been amended to comply with M.P.E.P. §608.01(b).

In the above Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for being anticipated by Bissonnette et al. (hereafter Bissonnette). While the Examiner referred to U.S. Patent No. "6,527,648" on page 2, line 2 of paragraph 2, it is believed the Examiner meant to refer to U.S. Patent No. "6,595,057" as this is the patent to Bissonnette et al. set forth in the Form PTO-892 attached to the Office Action. U.S. Patent No. 6,527,648 is to Erickson et al. and is not listed on the Form PTO-892. However, it is a parent of U.S. Patent No. 6,585,605 to Erikson et al. cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 26, 2004. If the Examiner meant to cite U.S. Patent No. 6,527,648, at least as a reference of interest, it would be appreciated if she would cite it in her next communication.

The indicated allowance of claims 9-16 and 18 and the subject matter of dependent claims 4-7 is appreciated. However, it is believed claims 1-3, 8, and 17 are not anticipated by Bissonnette for the following reasons and are also allowable.

A feature of claim 1 of the present application is the step of computing a coefficient of restitution of the impact surface of a golf club head using the resonance frequency of the impact surface of the golf club head obtained in a mass added state in which a mass regulating member is affixed to the impact surface, and the resonance frequency of the surface in a non-mass added state in which a mass regulating member is not affixed to the impact surface.

On the contrary, Bissonnette, with reference to column 16, line 16 to column 18, line 4, does not disclose obtaining a resonance frequency in a non-mass added state in which a mass regulating member is not affixed to the impact surface. More specifically,

Bissonnette only obtains a resonance frequency in a mass added state, because it is the combined mass of the mass 654 and the accelerometer 656 in Fig. 15 of Bissonnette, which corresponds to the mass regulating member of the present invention, that is impacted by the impact hammer 658, the impact force being transmitted to the face of the golf club through this mass as described in column 16, lines 42-48 of the reference. No where does Bissonnette disclose impacting the club head 652 in a non-mass added state where no mass regulating member is affixed to the impact face to obtain a resonance frequency in that state.

Therefore, Bissonnette does not acquire both a resonance frequency in a mass added state and a resonance frequency in a non-mass added state or compute a coefficient of restitution using those two resonance frequencies as defined in claim 1. As noted, Bissonnette only acquires a resonance frequency in a mass added state.

Accordingly, it submitted that neither claim 1 nor claims 2, 3, and 8 dependent therefrom can be considered anticipated by Bissonnette.

In addition, and with particular reference to claim 8, this claim defines that the response signal is a sound pressure signal and that the resonance frequencies in the mass added state and in the non-mass added state are obtained using these sound pressure signals. On the other hand, Bissonnette in column 16, lines 49-67) only describes using an acceleration signal.

In paragraph 2(d) of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Bissonnette discloses that the response signal is a "sound pressure signal" referring to column 16, lines 45-67. However, no where do applicants see reference to a "sound pressure signal" in this disclosure.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 8 is not anticipated by Bissonnette for this additional reason.

With respect to claim 17, this claim contains the same distinguishing feature as claim 1, namely a restitution coefficient computing portion that obtains a coefficient of restitution of the golf club head using both the resonance frequency of the impact surface of the golf club head in a mass added state and the resonance frequency of the surface in a non-mass added state. This, as noted above, is missing from Bissonnette.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 17 should also not be considered anticipated by Bissonnette.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 8, and 17 for being anticipated by Bissonnette and their allowance together with claims 4-7, 9-16, and 18 is requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the drawings filed April 9, 2004 have been received, but not whether they were accepted. Acceptance of the drawings in the next communication from the Examiner would be appreciated.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 16, 1005

By: 

Arthur S. Garrett

Reg. No. 20,338

**Attachments:      Replacement Abstract**

919207\_1